

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action, the specification and drawings are objected to for certain informalities.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification.

Claims 4 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 1,560,535 to *Burton*.

Claims 1, 3/1, 5, 6, and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,298,910 to *Price*.

Claims 1 and 7-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,191,988 to *Kumakura*.

Claims 1, 2, and 3/2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE 27 10 146 to *Hofmann* in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,298,910 to *Price*.

Claims 4 and 11 stand objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant files an Information Disclosure Statement to resubmit and describe the significance of a German technical document. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestion. Claims 2 and 5-10 have been amended to correct improper multiple dependencies and to put the claims in form for allowance. Dependent claims 3 and 4 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1-2 and 5-11 remain pending and are submitted for further consideration.

All Claims are Allowable

The Office Action incorrectly objects that Patent Abstracts of Japan Vol. 008, No. 250 (E-279), 16th November 1984 (1984-11-16), as cited in the specification, is not included in an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS). Applicant respectfully submits that the above-mentioned document is the printed and bound abstract of the JP 59 1275566 A (Mobuo Kiyokawa) 23rd July 1984 (1984-07-23) document which was submitted in a previous IDS on April 2, 2002, and reported in an International Search Report filed on December 28, 2001. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner remove his objection to this reference in the specification.

Additionally, Applicant concurrently files herewith an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) resubmitting the "*Lexikon der Technick*", Lueger, *et al.*, document previously submitted in the IDS filed April 2, 2002. A copy of the Preliminary Amendment filed December 28, 2001 which is an English-language translation of the above-mentioned reference is enclosed for the

Examiner's convenience. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner also remove his objection to this reference and acknowledge its submission on the PTO-1449 form.

All Subject Matter Complies With 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for the reasons stated below.

Contrary the assertions in the Office Action, the features of “several magnets . . . distributed uniformly around the circumference of the stator with respect to its axis . . . preferably arranged with matching polarity (NNNN) relative to this axis,” as recited in claim 7 are found in the specification on page 4. The polarities of the four magnets are oriented such that a magnet's North pole is parallel to the stator's axis. Further, the four magnets are shown distributed uniformly around the circumference of the stator. See Fig. 2 of the present specification. Fig. 2 also shows induced magnetic fields (S) located between the magnets. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant's specification enables one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention. Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, should be withdrawn.

Further, because claim 7 and Fig. 2 both disclose the features “several magnets . . . distributed uniformly around the circumference of the stator with respect to its axis . . . preferably arranged with matching polarity (NNNN) relative to this axis,” the drawings need not be corrected. Therefore, the objection to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a), should be withdrawn.

All Subject Matter Complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 4 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. The term “anti-parallel” as it appears in claim 4 will be replaced by the term “in series.” As such, Applicant respectfully submits that features of claim 4 (now in claim 1) put independent claim 1 in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

In regards to claim 11, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 is fully described and enabled in the specification at least at page 6. The specification describes the coils arranged in series and the first pair of diodes being illuminated through current generated by plural coils. The second pair of diodes being illuminated is accomplished by one less coil than the first. The language of claim 11 is appropriate and easily understood. Therefore, claim 11 is definite because it particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter Applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that all rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

All Subject Matter Complies With 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103

Claims 4 and 11 were objected to, but are now allowable because each claim has been put in independent form. Dependent claim 4 was canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, but its features have been added to independent claim 1. Claim 11 has been rewritten in independent form as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submits, therefore, that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103 are moot in light of these amendments.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 11 are allowable. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that all rejections under 35 U.S.C.


§102(b) and §103(a) be withdrawn. Moreover, dependent claims 2 and 5-10 are allowable at least because they recite the same combination of features as independent claim 1, as well as reciting additional features that further distinguishes them over the applied prior art.

Conclusion

The foregoing amendments are being made to place the application in condition for examination. A favorable action on the merits is respectfully solicited.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.R.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully Submitted,

By: 
Mary Jane Boswell
Reg. No. 33,652

Dated: December 5, 2003

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1800 M Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
202-467-7549 (Phone)